

"To a degree that is only just becoming known to the American people, we learned how to plant spies; we learned how to penetrate, subvert and overthrow foreign governments and, most astonishing of all, we even developed a network of secret agents within our own society."

Senator Fulbright
(N.Y. Times, April 23, 1967, p. 124)

GUATEMALA--1954

"A former executive of the United Fruit Company, now retired, Mr. Walter Turnbull, came to see me with two gentlemen whom he introduced as agents of the C.I.A. They said that I was a popular figure in Guatemala and that they wanted to lend their assistance to overthrow Arbenz. When I asked them their conditions for the assistance I found them unacceptable. Among other things, I was to promise to favor the United Fruit Company and the International Railways of Central America; to destroy the railroad workers' labor union; . . . to establish a strong-arm government, on the style of Ubico. Further, I was to pay back every cent that was invested in the undertaking."

President Miguel Fuentes on the
C.I.A. overthrow of the Arbenz
government.

My War with Communism (N.Y., 1963)
pp. 49-50

LAOS--1960

"In 1960, C.I.A. agents in Laos, disguised as military leaders, stuffed ballot boxes and engineered local uprisings to help a hand-picked strongman, General Nosavani, to initiate a pro-American government."

N.Y. Times, April 25, 1967

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA--1967

"Officers of the U.S.A. accused the C.I.A. of 'trapping' American college students into roles as agents and placing them under 'fantastic pressures' not to disclose their clandestine missions overseas."

N.Y. Times, February 12, 1967

The secret operations of the C.I.A. were so notorious that President Truman, who created the C.I.A. sixteen years before, wrote: "For some time I have been disturbed by the way the C.I.A. has been diverted from its original assignment. It has become an operational and at times a policy-making arm of the Government. . . . We have grown up as a nation, respected for our free institutions and for our ability to maintain a free and open society. There is something about the way the C.I.A. has been functioning that is casting a shadow over our historic position and I feel that we need to correct it."

Washington Post, December 22, 1963

"It has not yet, thank God, made us a police state, but it has brought us closer to it and, what is even more alarming, to greater public acceptance of certain practices associated with a police state--secret policy-making, unchecked executive power, subversion of foreign governments, bugging and spying and wire-tapping against our own people--than we have ever been in our history."

Senator Fulbright
(New York Times, April 23, 1967)
p. 124

President John F. Kennedy, after the Bay of Pigs episode, expressed a desire to "splinter the C.I.A. and scatter it to the winds."

N.Y. Times, April 25, 1967, p. 23

Thomas Jefferson wrote in 1319: "It should be remembered that whatever power in any government is independent is absolute also."

Also 5:00, 100 Invisible

Considering the activities of the C.I.A. in the last two decades, Senator Fulbright writes to all student leaders, university officials, professors and philanthropic organizations who are guilty of complicity: "Clearly, all of the private individuals and Government officials involved knew--or should have known--that what they were doing was inconsistent with democratic principles of free inquiry and representative government."

N.Y. Times, April 23, 1967, p. 126

If this isn't enough to make you think at least twice before joining, or supporting by your silence, the C.I.A., consult the following:

Ramparts, volume 5, no. 10, April, 1967.

Ramparts, volume 5, no. 9, March, 1967.

David Wise and Thomas Toss, The Invisible Government, (New York, 1955)

David Horowitz, The Free World Colossus (New York, 1965)

"The Garrison Interview," Playboy, October, 1967

Theodore Draper, Dominican Affair, (New York, 1966)

The C.I.A. is symptomatic of a general illness which affects our society. The security-conscious, militaristic foreign policy which our country pursues, must give way to a policy which meets human needs all over the world. Such a policy will mean the extinction of the C.I.A.

Approved For Release 2001/03/04 : CIA-RDP80-01601R000200040016-2

The act of blocking the recruiting functions of the C.I.A. is an act of civil disobedience. It is an act based not on a disregard but on a supreme respect for civil liberties: a respect which demands the right of free speech, free assembly, active dissent, and in defense of these freedoms, civil disobedience. It is an act of individual conscience which demands an end to the activities of the C.I.A. and to the continuing cold war philosophy of which it is a part. It rejects as morally repugnant the acts of the C.I.A. The C.I.A., under the cloak of anti-Communism, has overthrown governments, perpetrated atrocities, infiltrated and subverted domestic organizations independent of representational control.

We take this opportunity to confront this extension of the C.I.A.--in its recruiting function--and to demand a halt to its activities and to connect it with the harmful course of American foreign policy and suspicion and deceit on the national level.

We are not opposed to free discussion of issues, or to free debate. We are opposed to this government's foreign policy, we are opposed to the present structure of American society which demoralizes its citizens. We are opposed to a C.I.A. which forms in both areas to undermine human trust and responsibility at home and rights of others abroad.

We are obligated as American citizens to follow our consciences in trying to stop the C.I.A. We demanded this of the Germans at the Nuremberg Trials. We have not relinquished our faith in human beings nor violated their civil rights nor their right to hear arguments and counter-arguments. What we have affirmed is the need to see civil liberties as an active force that depend on the right of the individual to make moral decisions and to face the consequences of those moral decisions.

Will the university community understand the aims of civil disobedience if they put themselves in Germany in 1933 or even better in Greece in 1967? How do you effectively protest an arm of the Government which you feel to be profoundly immoral? At what point does an argument on civil liberties lead to an ad absurdum discussion of the rights of any governmental agency to simply exist or, more realistically, to adjust to pickets? Again it is a choice. The people sitting in have made their choice and you may disagree, and you may be right on a tactical basis. But to denounce the action in terms of civil liberties would be to belie the purpose of the sit-in and the meaning of civil liberties.